

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 11-13, 17, 19, 20, 22, 33-42, 47, 48 and 50 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Vataja. Claims 10 and 49 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Vataja in view of Owensby. Claims 14-16 and 18 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Vataja in view of Teshima. Claims 28-32, 45, 46 and 51-53 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vataja in view of Kohar. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested in view of the revised claims presented hereinabove and in light of the following remarks.

The Examiner states the following on page 18 of the Office Action:


“Again, the examiner suggests to clear up any broad limitations to specifically state that when the sender is in a target location a message is sent to another mobile device in a different location which both devices have no association with each other.”

Applicants do not believe that adoption of the Examiner’s suggestion is needed to patentably define the invention over the applied references. Nevertheless, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, the claims have been revised once again in an effort to satisfy the Examiner’s aim of more specificity. It is believed that the claims are now even more clearly allowable over the prior art. Prompt action to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, suggestions, or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order to facilitate reaching a resolution of any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By



Thomas Langer, Reg. No. 27,264
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: December 4, 2008